arXiv:1407.2176v3 [math.ST] 14 Jul 2014

Composite Robust Estimators for Linear Mixed Models

C. Agostinelli
Department of Environmental Sciences, Informatics and Statistics
Ca' Foscari University
Venice, Italy
E-mail: claudio@unive.it
and
V.J. Yohai
Departamento de Matemáticas and Instituto de Cálculo
FCEyN, University of Buenos Aires and CONICET
Buenos Aires, Argentina
E-mail: victoryohai@gmail.com

July 15, 2014

Abstract

The Classical Tukey-Huber Contamination Model (CCM) is a usual framework to describe the mechanism of outliers generation in robust statistics. In a data set with n observations and p variables, under the CCM, an outlier is a unit, even if only one or few values are corrupted. Classical robust procedures were designed to cope with this setting and the impact of observations were limited whenever necessary. Recently, a different mechanism of outliers generation, namely Independent Contamination Model (ICM), was introduced. In this new setting each cell of the data matrix might be corrupted or not with a probability independent on the status of the other cells. ICM poses new challenge to robust statistics since the percentage of contaminated rows dramatically increase with p, often reaching more than

50% . When this situation appears, classical affine equivariant robust procedures do not work since their breakdown point is 50%. For this contamination model we propose a new type of robust methods namely composite robust procedures which are inspired on the idea of composite likelihood, where low dimension likelihood, very often the likelihood of pairs, are aggregate together in order to obtain an approximation of the full likelihood which is more tractable. Our composite robust procedures are build over pairs of observations in order to gain robustness in the independent contamination model. We propose composite S and τ-estimators for linear mixed models. Composite τ-estimators are proved to have an high breakdown point both in the CCM and ICM. A Monte Carlo study shows that our estimators compare favorably with respect to classical S-estimators under the CCM and outperform them under the ICM. One example based on a real data set illustrates the new robust procedure.
Keywords: Composite S-estimators, Composite τ-estimators, Independent Contamination Model, Tukey-Huber Contamination Model, Robust estimation.

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to find robust procedures for mixed linear models. This class of models include among others ANOVA models with repeated measures, models with random nested design and models for studying longitudinal data. These models are generally based on the assumption that the data follow a normal distribution and therefore the parameters are estimated using the maximum likelihood principle. See for example, Searle, Casella, and Mcculloch (1992). As is well known, in general, the estimator obtained by maximum likelihood under the assumption that the data have a normal distribution is very sensitive to the presence of a small fraction of outliers in the sample. More than that, just one outlier may have an unbounded effect on this estimator. There are many robust estimators that have been proposed to avoid a large outlier influence. A large list of references of these proposals is available in Heritier, Cantoni, Copt, and Victoria-Feser (2009). Victoria-Feser and Copt (2006) introduces a very interesting robust S-estimator for mixed linear models based on M-scales which has breakdown point equal to 0.5. We can also mention Gill (2000), Jiang and Zhang (2001), Sinha (2004), Copt and Heritier (2006), Jacqmin-Gadda, Sibillot, Proust, Molina,

and Thiébaut (2007), Lachosa, Deyb, and Canchoc (2009), Chervoneva and Vishnyakov (2011) and Koller (2013a) which studied an SMDM-estimator. The procedure proposed in the last paper is implemented in the `R` package `robustlmm` (Koller, 2013b).

However all these procedures are focused on coping with outliers generated under the Classical (Tukey-Huber) Contamination Model (CCM), where some percentage of the units that compose the sample are replaced by outliers. However Alqallaf, Van Aelst, Zamar, and Yohai (2009) introduced another type of contamination (called Independent Contamination Model, ICM) that may occur in multivariate data. Instead of contaminating a percentage of the units that compose the sample, the different cells of each unit may be independently contaminated. In this case, if the dimension of each unit is large, even a small fraction of cell contamination may lead to a large fraction of units with at least one contaminated cell. This type of contamination specially occurs when the different variables that compose each unit are measured from independent laboratories. Alqallaf et al. (2009) showed that for this type of contamination the breakdown point of affine equivariant procedures for multivariate location and covariance matrix tends to zero when the number of variables increases and therefore their degree of robustness is not satisfactory. A similar phenomenon occurs when dealing with mixed linear models. In particular the S-estimator procedure introduced in Victoria-Feser and Copt (2006) loses robustness for high dimensional data with independent contamination.

In this paper we propose a new class of robust estimators for linear mixed models. These estimators may be thought as robust counterparts of the composite likelihood estimators proposed by Lindsay (1988). If a vector $\boldsymbol{y}$ of dimension p is observed, the composite likelihood estimators are based on the likelihood of all the subvectors of a dimension $p^* < p$. The estimators that we propose here are based on τ-scales of the Mahalanobis distances of two dimensional subvectors of $\boldsymbol{y}$. The τ-scale estimators were introduced by Yohai and Zamar (1988) and provides scales estimators which are simultaneously highly robust and highly efficient. We are going to show that these estimators have a robust behavior for both contamination models: the classical contamination model and the independent contamination model. In particular we will show that the breakdown point for the classical contamination model is 0.5, while for the independent contamination model is 0.25.

In Section 2 the model and the notation are presented. Section 2.1 introduces the Composite S-estimator, while Section 3 defines the Composite

τ-estimator. Sections 4 and 5 discuss the breakdown properties and the asymptotic normality of the Composite τ-estimator, Section 6 provides details on the computational algorithm and Section 7 illustrates with a real data set the advantages of the proposed estimator. In Section 8 we perform a Monte Carlo simulation that shows that the proposed procedure has a robust behavior under both contamination models. Section 9 provides some concluding remarks. An Appendix contains details on computational aspects and the proofs of statements reported in previous Sections.

2 Model and Notation

Denote by $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$ the multivariate normal distribution of dimension p with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariance matrix Σ. Many statistical models for components of variance and longitudinal analysis are of the following form. In the case of fixed covariables is assumed that n independent p-dimensional random vectors $\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_n$ in $\mathbb{R}^p$ are observed, and $\boldsymbol{y}_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ has distribution $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \Sigma(\eta, \boldsymbol{\gamma}))$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\mu}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= (\mu_{i1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \ldots, \mu_{ip}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))^\top \\ &= \boldsymbol{x}_i\boldsymbol{\beta},\ 1 \leq i \leq n, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_n$ are a fixed $p \times k$ matrices and $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is an unknown k-vector parameter. Moreover,

$$\Sigma(\eta, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \eta(V_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{J} \gamma_j V_j), \tag{2}$$

where V_j, $1 \leq j \leq J$ are $p \times p$ matrices, V_0 is the $p \times p$ identity, $\eta > 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_J)^\top \in \Gamma$ are unknown parameters, where

$$\Gamma = \{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^J :\ \Sigma(1, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \quad \text{is positive definite}\}.$$

In the case of random covariables, that is, when $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_n$ are i.i.d random matrices, it is assumed that

$$\boldsymbol{y}_i | \boldsymbol{x}_i \sim N_p\left(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \Sigma(\eta, \boldsymbol{\gamma})\right). \tag{3}$$

This is equivalent to $\boldsymbol{u}_i = \boldsymbol{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ independent of $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ with distribution $N_p(\boldsymbol{0}, \Sigma(\eta, \boldsymbol{\gamma}))$. However, in Section 5, where we study the asymptotic properties of the proposed estimators, we use a weaker assumption. In fact we

only require that $\boldsymbol{u}_i$ be independent of $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ and have elliptical distribution with center $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma(\eta, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$.

This setup covers several statistical models, for instance that of the form

$$\boldsymbol{y}_i = \boldsymbol{x}_i\boldsymbol{\beta} + \sum_{j=1}^{J} \boldsymbol{z}_j\zeta_{ij} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i,\ 1 \le i \le n, \tag{4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ are as before, $\boldsymbol{z}_j$, $1 \le j \le J$, are $p \times q_j$ known design matrices for the random effects, ζ_{ij} are independent q_j-dimensional vectors with distribution $N_{q_j}(0, \sigma_j^2 \boldsymbol{I}_{q_j})$, where $\boldsymbol{I}_p$ is the $p \times p$ identity and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$ $(1 \le i \le n)$ are p-dimensional error vectors with distribution $N(0, \sigma_0^2 I_p)$. Then, in this case we have $\eta = \sigma_0^2, \boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_J)^\top$ with $\gamma_j = \sigma_j^2/\sigma_0^2 > 0$, $V_j = \boldsymbol{z}_j\boldsymbol{z}_j^\top$, $1 \le j \le J$.

2.1 Composite S-estimator

A very interesting class of S-estimators for the model defined by (1) and (2) was proposed by Victoria-Feser and Copt (2006).

Given a p dimensional column vector $\boldsymbol{y}$ and a vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $p \times p$ matrix Σ the square of the Mahalanobis distance is defined by

$$m(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma) = (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{\mu}).$$

Let $\rho : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$, where $\mathbb{R}^+$ is the set of nonnegative real numbers, satisfying the following properties:

A1 $\rho(0) = 0$.

A2 $0 \le v \le v^*$ implies $\rho(v) \le \rho(v^*)$.

A3 ρ is continuous.

A4 $\sup_v \rho(v) = 1$.

A5 If $\rho(u) < 1$ and $0 \le u < v$, then $\rho(u) < \rho(v)$.

Let b be defined by

$$E_{\chi_p^2}(\rho(v)) = b,$$

where $v \sim \chi^2_p$ is a chi-square distribution with p degrees of freedom. Then, given a sample $\boldsymbol{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_n)^\top$, an M-scale estimator $s(\boldsymbol{m})$ is defined by the value s solution of

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho\left(\frac{m_i}{s}\right) = b. \tag{5}$$

The S-estimator proposed by Victoria-Feser and Copt (2006) is defined by

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\eta}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) = \arg\min_{\eta,\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \det \Sigma(\eta, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$$

subject to

$$s(m(\boldsymbol{y}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \Sigma(\eta, \boldsymbol{\gamma})), \ldots, m(\boldsymbol{y}_n, \boldsymbol{\mu}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \Sigma(\eta, \boldsymbol{\gamma}))) = 1.$$

These estimators can be thought as a constrained version of the S-estimators for multidimensional location and scatter proposed by Davies (1987).

Given a squared matrix A we denote by $A^* = A/|A|^{1/p}$ where $|A|$ is the determinant of the matrix A. Note that $\Sigma^*(\eta, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ depends only on $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and then will be denoted by $\Sigma^*(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$. It is easy to show that the estimators proposed by Victoria-Feser and Copt (2006) can be also defined by

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}} s(m(\boldsymbol{y}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \Sigma^*(\boldsymbol{\gamma})), \ldots, m(\boldsymbol{y}_n, \boldsymbol{\mu}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \Sigma^*(\boldsymbol{\gamma}))),$$
$$\widehat{\eta} = s(m(\boldsymbol{y}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \Sigma(1, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})), \ldots, m(\boldsymbol{y}_n, \boldsymbol{\mu}_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \Sigma(1, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}))),$$

where the M-scale s is defined now by (5). Notice that $\widehat{\eta}$ is defined by

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho\left(\frac{m(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \mu_i(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \Sigma(1, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}))}{\widehat{\eta}}\right) = b.$$

In the classical contamination model a fraction ε of the vectors $\boldsymbol{y}_i$ are replaced by outliers. Victoria-Feser and Copt (2006) show that for this model the breakdown point of this estimator is $\varepsilon^* = \min(b, 1-b)$. Therefore if $b = 0.5$, we get $\varepsilon^* = 0.5$.

Alqallaf et al. (2009) consider a different contamination model for multivariate data: the independent contamination model. In this contamination model if we observe a vector $\boldsymbol{y}_i = (y_{i1}, \ldots, y_{ip})^\top$ each component y_{ij} of $\boldsymbol{y}_i$ has probability ε of being replaced by an outlier. Therefore the probability

that at least one component of $\boldsymbol{y}_i$ be contaminated is $1-(1-\varepsilon)^p$, and this number is close to one when p is large even if ε is small.

Alqallaf et al. (2009) showed that the breakdown point for the independent contamination model of S-estimators of multivariate location and scatter tends to 0 when $p \to \infty$. The same happens with other popular affine equivariance estimators like the minimum volume ellipsoid (Rousseeuw, 1985), Minimum covariance determinant (Rousseeuw, 1985) or the Donoho-Stahel estimators (Donoho, 1982; Stahel, 1981). The S-estimator proposed by Victoria-Feser and Copt (2006) for model (1)-(2) have a similar shortcoming: when $p \to \infty$, its breakdown point tends to 0 under the independent contamination model. For this reason, hereafter we introduce a new type of estimators namely composite S-estimators and composite τ-estimators.

Given a vector $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_p)^\top$, a $p \times p$ matrix A and for a couple (j, l) of indices $(1 \leq j < l \leq p)$ we denote $\boldsymbol{a}^{jl} = (a_j, a_l)^\top$ and A_{jl} the submatrix

$$A_{jl} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{jj} & a_{jl} \\ a_{lj} & a_{ll} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In a similar way, given a $p \times k$ matrix $\boldsymbol{x}$ we denote by $\boldsymbol{x}^{jl}$ the matrix of dimension $2 \times k$ built by using the corresponding (j, l) rows of $\boldsymbol{x}$. We define a pairwise squared Mahalanobis distance and a pairwise scale by

$$\begin{aligned} m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= m(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \Sigma_{jl}^*(\boldsymbol{\gamma})), \\ s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= s(m_1^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}), \ldots, m_n^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where the M-scale s is now defined by (5) with b given by

$$E_{\chi_2^2}(\rho(v)) = b. \tag{7}$$

Thus $S(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ is defined by

$$S(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \sum_{l=j+1}^{p} s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}). \tag{8}$$

Similarly to Victoria-Feser and Copt (2006), we define for the model in (1)-(2), the composite S-estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ by

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}} S(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \tag{9}$$

and the estimator $\widehat{\eta}$ of η by

$$\frac{2}{p(p-1)n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{p}\rho\left(\frac{(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl}-\boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top\Sigma_{jl}(1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl}-\boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\widehat{\eta}}\right)=b. \quad (10)$$

One shortcoming of the composite S-estimators are, as occurs with regression S-estimators, that they are not simultaneously highly robust and highly efficient. For this reason in next section we introduce the composite τ-estimators which are defined similarly to the S-estimators, but replacing the M-scale by a τ-scale.

3 Composite τ-Estimator

In this section we introduce the composite τ-estimator. A τ-scale is defined using two functions ρ_1 and ρ_2. Given a sample $\boldsymbol{m}=(m_1,\ldots,m_n)^\top$, the function ρ_1 is used to define an M-scale s by

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\rho_1\left(\frac{m_i}{s}\right)=b, \quad (11)$$

and the τ-scale by

$$\tau=s\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\rho_2\left(\frac{m_i}{s}\right).$$

We will require that ρ_1 and ρ_2 satisfy A1-A5. Put $\psi_i(v)=\rho_i'(v)$, $i=1,2$. In Yohai and Zamar (1988) it is shown that to guarantee the Fisher consistency of the τ-estimators of regression, it is required that ρ_2 satisfies the following condition:

A6 ρ_2 is continuously differentiable and $2\rho_2(v)-\psi_2(v)v>0$ for $v>0$.

The breakdown point of the τ-scale is the same as that of the s-scale. Then we are going to set $b=0.5$ to have breakdown point close to 0.5 in the classical contamination model.

The estimators are going to be defined as in the previous section by replacing the M-scales by the τ-scales. Then $s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ is defined as in (6) and the τ-scale is

$$\tau_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})=s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\frac{1}{n}\sum\rho_2\left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\right).$$

Let $T(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ be the sum of all the τ_{jl} scales, i.e.,

$$T(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \sum_{l=j+1}^{p} \tau_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}), \tag{12}$$

then the composite τ-estimator of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ is defined as follows

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}} T(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}), \tag{13}$$

while $\widehat{\eta}$ is obtained as in (10) setting $\rho = \rho_1$.

In the example of Section 7 and in the Monte Carlo study of Section 8 we took ρ_i, $i = 1, 2$ in the following family of functions,

$$\rho_c^{\mathrm{o}*}(u) = \rho_c^{\mathrm{o}}(u^{1/2}), \tag{14}$$

where ρ_c^{o} is the family of rho functions introduced by Muler and Yohai (2002) defined by

$$\rho_c^{\mathrm{o}}(v) = \begin{cases} \frac{v^2}{2ac^2} & v \leq 2 \\ \frac{1}{a}\left(\frac{a_4}{8}\frac{v^8}{c^8} + \frac{a_3}{6}\frac{v^6}{c^6} + \frac{a_2}{4}\frac{v^4}{c^4} + \frac{a_1}{2}\frac{v^2}{c^2} + a_0\right) & 2 < v \leq 3 \\ 1 & v > 3 \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where $a_0 = 1.792$, $a_1 = -1.944$, $a_2 = 1.728$, $a_3 = -0.312$, $a_4 = 0.016$ and $a = 3.250$. The functions in this family have shapes close to that of those in the optimal family obtained by Yohai and Zamar (1997). However, they are easier to compute. The reason why we compose the function $\rho_c^{\mathrm{o}}(v)$ with the square root is that the functions $\rho_c^{\mathrm{o}*}$ are applied to the squared Mahalanobis distances. Notice that for any $\lambda > 0$, the τ scale obtained with $\rho_1 = \rho_{\lambda c_1}^{\mathrm{o}*}$ and $\rho_2 = \rho_{\lambda c_2}^{\mathrm{o}*}$ is equal to the τ scale corresponding to $\rho_1 = \rho_{c_1}^{\mathrm{o}*}$ and $\rho_2 = \rho_{c_2}^{\mathrm{o}*}$ divided by λ. Hence without loss of generality we can take $\rho_1 = \rho_1^{\mathrm{o}*}$. We found that taking $\rho_2 = \rho_{1.64}^{\mathrm{o}*}$ we obtain a good trade-off between robustness and efficiency, and these are the values that we recommend to use.

It is easy to show that the composite τ-estimators are equivariant for regression transformations of the form $\boldsymbol{y}_i^* = \boldsymbol{y}_i + \boldsymbol{x}_i\boldsymbol{\delta}$ where $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is a $k \times 1$ vector, affine transformations of the form $\boldsymbol{x}_i^* = \boldsymbol{x}_i B$, where B is a $k \times k$ non singular matrix or scale transformations of the form $\boldsymbol{y}_i^* = \zeta y_i$, where ζ is a scalar.

4 Breakdown point

Donoho and Huber (1983) introduced the concept of a finite sample breakdown point (FSBDP). For our case, let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}} = \widehat{\eta}(1, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})$ be estimators of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\upsilon} = (\eta, \eta\boldsymbol{\gamma})$. Informally speaking, the FSBDP of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is the smallest fraction of outliers that makes the estimator unbounded.

To formalize this, let $\boldsymbol{T}$ be a data set of size n corresponding to model (1)-(2), $\boldsymbol{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{t}_n)$, $\boldsymbol{t}_i = (\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i) = (\boldsymbol{t}_{i1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{t}_{ip})^\top$, $\boldsymbol{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times k}$ and $\boldsymbol{t}_{ij} = (y_{ij}, x_{ij1}, \ldots, x_{ijk})$ $(1 \le j \le p)$. Let $\mathcal{T}_m^{(\mathrm{C})}$ be the set of all the samples $\check{\boldsymbol{T}} = (\check{\boldsymbol{t}}_1, \ldots, \check{\boldsymbol{t}}_n)$ with $\check{\boldsymbol{t}}_i = (\check{\boldsymbol{t}}_{i1}, \ldots, \check{\boldsymbol{t}}_{ip})^\top$ such that $\#\{i : \check{\boldsymbol{t}}_i = \boldsymbol{t}_i\} \ge n - m$. Given estimators $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}$ we let

$$
\begin{aligned}
B_m^{(\mathrm{C})}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) &= \sup\{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}})\|, \check{\boldsymbol{T}} \in \mathcal{T}_m^{(\mathrm{C})}\},\\
B_m^{+(\mathrm{C})}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}) &= \sup\{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}})\|, \check{\boldsymbol{T}} \in \mathcal{T}_m^{(\mathrm{C})}\},\\
B_m^{-(\mathrm{C})}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}) &= \inf\{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}})\|, \check{\boldsymbol{T}} \in \mathcal{T}_m^{(\mathrm{C})}\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 1 *The finite sample breakdown point of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ for classical contamination (FSBDPCC) at the sample $\boldsymbol{T}$ is defined by $\varepsilon^{(C)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = m^*/n$ where $m^* = \min\{m : B_m^{(C)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \infty\}$ and the breakdown point of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}$ by $\varepsilon^{(C)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}) = m^*/n$ where*

$$
m^* = \min\{m : \frac{1}{B_m^{-(C)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}})} + B_m^{+(C)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}) = \infty\}.
$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_m^{(\mathrm{I})\cdot}$ be the set of all the samples $\check{\boldsymbol{T}} = (\check{\boldsymbol{t}}_1, \ldots, \check{\boldsymbol{t}}_n)$ such that $\#\{i : \check{\boldsymbol{t}}_{ij} = \boldsymbol{t}_{ij}\} \ge n - m$ for each j, $1 \le j \le p$. Given estimators $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}$ we let

$$
\begin{aligned}
B_m^{(\mathrm{I})\cdot}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) &= \sup\{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}})\|, \check{\boldsymbol{T}} \in \mathcal{T}_m^{(\mathrm{I})}\},\\
B_m^{+(\mathrm{I})}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}) &= \sup\{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}})\|, \check{\boldsymbol{T}} \in \mathcal{T}_m^{(\mathrm{I})}\},\\
B_m^{-(\mathrm{I})}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}) &= \inf\{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}})\|, \check{\boldsymbol{T}} \in \mathcal{T}_m^{(\mathrm{I})}\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 2 *The finite sample breakdown point for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ under independent contamination (FSBDPIC) at the sample $\boldsymbol{T}$ is defined by $\varepsilon^{(I)}(\boldsymbol{T},\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = m^*/n$ where $m^* = \min\{m : B_m^{(I)}(\boldsymbol{T},\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \infty\}$ and the breakdown point of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}$ by $\varepsilon^{(I)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}) = m^*/n$ where*

$$
m^* = \min\{m : \frac{1}{B_m^{-(I)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}})} + B_m^{+(I)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}) = \infty\}.
$$

The following theorems, whose proofs are discussed in Appendix B, gives a lower bound for the breakdown point of composite τ-estimators under both the classical and the independent contamination models. Before to state the Theorems we need the following notation. Given a sample $\boldsymbol{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{t}_n)$ we define

$$h_{jl}(\boldsymbol{T}) = \max_{\|\boldsymbol{b}\|>0} \#\{i : \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{0}\}, \tag{16}$$

$$h(\boldsymbol{T}) = \max_{jl} h_{jl}(\boldsymbol{T}), \tag{17}$$

$$h_{jl}^*(\boldsymbol{T}) = \max_{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|>0,\boldsymbol{b}} \#\{i : \boldsymbol{u}^\top(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{b}) = \boldsymbol{0}\}, \tag{18}$$

$$h^*(\boldsymbol{T}) = \max_{jl} h_{jl}^*(\boldsymbol{T}), \tag{19}$$

$$f(\boldsymbol{T}) = h(\boldsymbol{T}) + h^*(\boldsymbol{T}). \tag{20}$$

Theorem 1 *Let $\boldsymbol{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{t}_n)$, $\boldsymbol{t}_i = (\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i)$, f as defined in (20). Assume that A1-A6 holds and let $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})$ be the composite τ-estimator for the model given by (1) and (2). Then a lower bound for $\varepsilon^{(C)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and for $\varepsilon^{(C)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})$ is given by* $\min((1-b) - f(\boldsymbol{T})/n, b)$.

Note that taking $b = 0.5$, this lower bound is close to 0.5 for large n independently of p.

Theorem 2 *Let $\boldsymbol{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{t}_n)$, $\boldsymbol{t}_i = (\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i)$, f as defined in (20). Assume that A1-A6 holds and let $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})$ be the composite τ-estimator for the model given by (1) and (2). Then a lower bound for $\varepsilon^{(I)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and for $\varepsilon^{(I)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})$ is given by* $0.5\min((1-b) - f(\boldsymbol{T})/n, b)$.

In this case taking $b = 0.5$ this lower bound is close to 0.25 for large n independently of p.

5 Consistency and Asymptotic Normality

In this Section we study the almost sure consistency and asymptotic normality of the composite τ-estimators. We need the following additional assumptions for consistency

A7 The vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ is random and the error $\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$ has an elliptical density of the form

$$f(\boldsymbol{u}) = \frac{f_0^*(\boldsymbol{u}^\top \Sigma(\eta_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})}{|\Sigma(\eta_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)|^{1/2}}, \tag{21}$$

where f_0^* is non increasing and is strictly decreasing in a neighborhood of 0.

A8 Let H_0 be the distribution of $\boldsymbol{x}$**.** Then for any $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq \mathbf{0}$ we have $P_{H_0}(\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq \mathbf{0}) > 0$

A9 (Identification condition). If $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \neq \boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$ for all α we have $\Sigma(1, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \neq \Sigma(\alpha, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^*)$.

An important family of distributions satisfying A7 is the multivariate normal, in this case,

$$f_0^*(z) = (2\pi)^{-p/2} \exp(-z/2). \tag{22}$$

Note that when the $(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i)$s satisfy (1), (2) and (3), A7 is satisfied. The following Theorem states the consistency of composite τ-estimators.

Theorem 3 *Let $\boldsymbol{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{t}_n)$, $\boldsymbol{t}_i = (\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, be i.i.d random vectors with distribution F_0 and call H_0 the marginal distribution of the $\boldsymbol{x}_i$s. Assume (i) ρ_1 satisfies (A1-A5), (ii) ρ_2 satisfies A1-A6, (iii) under F_0 A7 and A8 holds and (iv) A9. Then, the composite τ-estimators $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ and $\widehat{\eta}$ satisfy $\lim_{n\to\infty} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ (a.s.), $\lim_{n\to\infty} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0$ (a.s.). Moreover, if f_0^* is given by (22) we also have $\lim_{n\to\infty} \widehat{\eta} = \eta_0$ (a.s.).*

Note that for the consistency of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is not necessary that $\boldsymbol{y}_i|\boldsymbol{x}_i$ be multivariate normal. We do not give a formal proof of this Theorem. In Theorem 5 of the Appendix C we give a rigorous proof of the Fisher consistency of the estimating functional associated to the compose τ-estimator. From this result we derive an heuristic proof of Theorem 3.

The following Theorem states the asymptotic normality of composite τ-estimators. We need the following assumptions

A10 Let H_0 be the distribution of $\boldsymbol{x}$. Then H_0 has finite second moments and $E_{H_0}(\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}^\top)$ is non–singular.

A11 The functions ρ_i, $i = 1, 2$ are twice differentiable.

Theorem 4 *Let* $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top)^\top$ *and* $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^\top)^\top$ *be the composite* τ*-estimator. Consider the same assumptions as in Theorem 3, A10 and A11. Then, we have*

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \xrightarrow{D} N\left(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\right),$$

where

$$\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = E\left[\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} T(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right]^{-1} E\left[\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} T(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\ \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} T(\boldsymbol{\lambda})^T\right] \left(E\left[\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} T(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right]^{-1}\right)^T,$$

and $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} T(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ *and* $\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} T(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ *are the gradient and Hessian matrix of* $T(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ *respectively.*

We do not give the proof of Theorem 4. However, it can be obtained using standard delta method arguments, see for example Theorem 10.9 in Maronna, Martin, and Yohai (2006). This Theorem allows to define Wald tests for null hypothesis and confidence intervals for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, but not for η. However in most practical applications the interest is centered in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$.

6 Computational aspects

The composite τ-estimators are obtained by an iterative algorithm. Hereafter we provide some details. Given starting values $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(0)}$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(0)}$, we perform iterations on steps **(A)-(C)** until convergence. Suppose that we have already computed $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(h)}$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(h)}$, then we performed the following steps **A**, **B** and **C** to obtain $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(h+1)}$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(h+1)}$:

(A) Find scales $s_{jl}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(h)}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(h)})$ $(1 \leq j < l \leq p)$ by solving equations

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho_1\left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(h)}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(h)})}{s_{jl}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(h)}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(h)})}\right) = b$$

(B) Update $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by the fixed point equation using equation (25) derived in Appendix A.1. That is,

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(h+1)} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{p} \tilde{W}_i^{jl}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(h)}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(h)}) \left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl}\right)\right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{p} \tilde{W}_i^{jl}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(h)}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(h)}) \left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top} \dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl}\right),$$

where $\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl} = \Sigma_{jl}^{*-1/2}\boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}$.

(C) A fixed point equation for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ can be derived from the estimating equation (27). However we found that to use this equation to update $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ was numerically unstable. We preferred to make this updating by means of a direct minimization of the goal function T defined in (12), that is, we define $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(h+1)}$ by

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(h+1)} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} T(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(h+1)}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}).$$

For this purpose, in the example of Section 7 and in the Monte Carlo study of Section 8 we used the function `optim` of the `R` program.

(D) Once the convergence criterion for $(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(h)}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(h)})$ is reached, the estimator of η is obtained by solving the equation (10).

To start the iterative algorithm the initial estimators $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(0)}$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(0)}$ are necessary. Let $\boldsymbol{Y} = (\boldsymbol{y}_1^\top, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_n^\top)^\top$, $\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(j)}$ the j-th column of $\boldsymbol{x}_i$, $\boldsymbol{X}_j = (\boldsymbol{x}_1^{(j)\top}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_n^{(j)\top})^\top$, $1 \leq j \leq k$. Then, $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(0)}$can be obtained by means of robust regression estimator using $\boldsymbol{Y}$ as response and $\boldsymbol{X}_j$, $1 \leq j \leq k$ as covariables. In our algorithm we use an MM-estimator as implemented in function `lmRob` of the `R` package `robust` using an efficiency of 0.85. Once this initial estimator $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(0)}$ is computed, the residuals $\boldsymbol{r}_i = \boldsymbol{y}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(0)}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$ can be evaluated. Then, a robust covariance matrix of $\boldsymbol{u}$ robust under the ICM model is obtained applying to these residuals the estimator presented in Agostinelli, Leung, Yohai, and Zamar (2014) based on filtering and S-estimators with missing observations. Call $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ to this matrix and let $\boldsymbol{t}$ be the vector of the $p(p+1)/2$ values of the lower triangular side of this matrix including the diagonal elements. In a similar way, let $\boldsymbol{v}_j$ be the column vector of the $p(p+1)/2 \times 1$ values of the lower triangular side of the matrix V_j. An initial estimator $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{(0)}$ of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ could be obtained by means of a regression estimator using $\boldsymbol{t}$ as response and $\boldsymbol{v}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{v}_J$ as covariables. Since neither $\boldsymbol{t}$ nor $\boldsymbol{v}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{v}_J$ need to have outliers, it is not necessary to use a robust estimator, in fact we use function `lm` of `R` to perform this step.

7 Example

Hereafter we present one application of the introduced method on a real data set. The example is a prospective longitudinal study of children with disorder of neural development. In this data set, outliers are present in the couples rather than in the units and the composite τ-estimator provides a different analysis with respect to maximum likelihood and classical robust procedures.

7.1 Autism

The data used in this example were collected by researchers at the University of Michigan (Anderson, Oti, Lord, and Welch, 2009) as part of a prospective longitudinal study of 214 children and they are analyzed, among others, also in West, Welch, and Galecki (2007). The children were divided into three diagnostic groups when they were 2 years old: autism, pervasive developmental disorder (PDD), and nonspectrum children. The study was designed to collect information on each child at ages 2, 3, 5, 9, and 13 years, although not all children were measured at each age. One of the study objectives was to assess the relative influence of the initial diagnostic category (autism or PDD), language proficiency at age 2, and other covariates on the developmental trajectories of the socialization of these children. Study participants were children who had consecutive referrals to one of two autism clinics before the age of 3 years. Social development was assessed at each age using the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Interview survey form, a parent-reported measure of socialization. The dependent variable, vsae (Vineland Socialization Age Equivalent), was a combined score that included assessments of interpersonal relationships, play/leisure time activities, and coping skills. Initial language development was assessed using the Sequenced Inventory of Communication Development (SICD) scale; children were placed into one of three groups (sicdegp, $s_{(1)}, s_{(2)}, s_{(3)}$, where $s_{(k)}$ is the indicator function of the k group) based on their initial SICD scores on the expressive language subscale at age 2. We consider the subset of $n = 41$ children for which all measurements are available. We analyze this data using a regression model with random coefficients where vsae is explained by intercept, age, age^2 and sicdegp as a factor variable plus interaction among the age related variables and sicdegp. Hereafter, the variable age is shifted by 2. Let y_{ij} be the value of the i-th vsae for the j-th ages value a_j, then it is assumed that for $1 \leq i \leq 41$,

$1 \leq j \leq 5$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_{ij} &= b_{i1} + b_{i2}a_j + b_{i3}a_j^2 \\ &\quad + \beta_4 s_{(1)i} + \beta_5 s_{(2)i} \\ &\quad + \beta_6 a_j \times s_{(1)i} + \beta_7 a_j \times s_{(2)i} + \beta_8 a_j^2 \times s_{(1)i} + \beta_9 a_j^2 \times s_{(2)i} + \varepsilon_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

where (b_{i1}, b_{i2}, b_{i3}) are i.i.d. random coefficients with mean $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$ and covariance matrix

$$\Sigma_b = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{1a} & \sigma_{1a^2} \\ \sigma_{1a} & \sigma_{aa} & \sigma_{aa^2} \\ \sigma_{1a^2} & \sigma_{aa^2} & \sigma_{a^2a^2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

$\beta_4, \ldots, \beta_9$ are fixed coefficients and the ε_{ij} are i.i.d. random errors independent of the random coefficients with zero mean and variance $\sigma_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$. Then, the model could be rewritten in term of (1) and (2) with $p = 5$, $n = 41$, $J = 6$ and $k = 9$, $\boldsymbol{y}_i = (y_{i1}, \ldots, y_{i5})^\top$,

$$\boldsymbol{x}_i = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_1 & a_1^2 & s_{(1)i} & s_{(2)i} & a_1\ s_{(1)i} & a_1\ s_{(2)i} & a_1^2\ s_{(1)i} & a_1^2\ s_{(2)i} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ 1 & a_5 & a_5^2 & s_{(1)i} & s_{(2)i} & a_5\ s_{(1)i} & a_5\ s_{(2)i} & a_5^2\ s_{(1)i} & a_5^2\ s_{(2)i} \end{pmatrix},$$

while the variance and covariance structure $\Sigma(\eta, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \eta(I + \sum_{j=1}^{J} \gamma_j V_j)$ is as follows. Let, $\boldsymbol{j}$ a 5-vector of ones, $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5)^\top$, which corresponds to age and $\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{a}^2$ which corresponds to age^2. Then, we have $V_1 = \boldsymbol{j}\boldsymbol{j}^\top$, $V_2 = \boldsymbol{a}\boldsymbol{a}^\top$, $V_3 = \boldsymbol{b}\boldsymbol{b}^\top$, $V_4 = \boldsymbol{j}\boldsymbol{a}^\top + \boldsymbol{a}\boldsymbol{j}^\top$, $V_5 = \boldsymbol{j}\boldsymbol{b}^\top + \boldsymbol{b}\boldsymbol{j}^\top$ and $V_6 = \boldsymbol{a}\boldsymbol{b}^\top + \boldsymbol{b}\boldsymbol{a}^\top$. $\eta = \sigma_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$ is the scale of the error term, $\gamma_1 = \sigma_{11}/\sigma_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$, $\gamma_2 = \sigma_{aa}/\sigma_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$, $\gamma_3 = \sigma_{a^2a^2}/\sigma_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$, $\gamma_4 = \sigma_{1a}/\sigma_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$, $\gamma_5 = \sigma_{1a^2}/\sigma_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$ and $\gamma_6 = \sigma_{aa^2}/\sigma_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$.

Table 1 report the estimators and the inference for the fixed term parameters using different methods, while Table 2 reports the estimators of the random effect terms. ML, S and SMDM provide similar results, while differences are present with the composite τ method. Main differences are on the estimation of the random effects terms, both in size (error variance component) and shape (correlation components). Composite τ assign part of the total variance to the random components while the other methods assign it to the error term. In fact, variances estimated by composite τ are in general larger than that estimated by the other methods; composite τ suggests negative correlation between intercept and age, while ML, S and SMDM suggest positive correlation. Composite τ provides small estimates compared to

Method	Int.	a	a^2	$s_{(1)}$	$s_{(2)}$	$a \times s_{(1)}$	$a \times s_{(2)}$	$a^2 \times s_{(1)}$	$a^2 \times s_{(2)}$
Max. Lik.	12.847	6.851	−0.062	−5.245	−2.154	−6.345	−4.512	0.133	0.236
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.579]	[0.041]	[0.325]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.446]	[0.121]
Composite τ	12.143	6.308	−0.089	−5.214	−4.209	−5.361	−3.852	0.082	0.061
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.329]	[0.000]	[0.012]	[0.000]	[0.001]	[0.578]	[0.677]
S Rocke	10.934	7.162	−0.107	−4.457	−0.108	−5.769	−4.995	0.094	0.419
	[0.000]	[0.001]	[0.666]	[0.049]	[0.957]	[0.002]	[0.000]	[0.688]	[0.011]
SMDM	12.346	6.020	0.001	−5.192	−2.173	−5.190	−3.870	0.046	0.151
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.992]	[0.010]	[0.213]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.781]	[0.300]

Table 1: Autism data set. Estimated fixed term parameters by different methods. P-values are reported under squared parenthesis.

the other methods for the error variance. These discrepancies reflects mainly on the inference for the fixed term coefficients where the variable sicdegp is significant using composite τ but is not using ML, S and SMDM procedures. Interactions between age^2 and sicdegp is highly non significant using composite τ and SMDM while it is somewhat significant using S.

To investigate more the reasons of differences between composite robust procedure and classic robust procedure results, we investigate cell, couple and row outliers. For a given dimension $1 \leq q \leq p$ we define as q-dimension outliers those q-dimension observations such that the corresponding squared Mahalanobis distance is greater than a quantile order α of a chi-square distribution with q degree of freedom. In particular we call cell, couple and row outliers the 1-dimension, 2-dimension and p-dimension outliers respectively. Composite τ procedure identifies 33 couple outliers out of 410 couples (8%) at $\alpha = 0.999$. The affected rows, with at least one couple outliers, are 12 out of 41. This means that the classic S and SMDM procedures have to deal with a data set with a level of contamination about 29%. We also run the analysis using the composite S estimator, not reported here, the results are similar to those obtained by the composite τ estimator.

8 Monte Carlo simulations

In this section we describe the results of a Monte Carlo study with the aim of illustrating the performance of the new procedure in the classical contamination Model (CCM) and in the independent contamination model (ICM). We

Method	σ_{11}	σ_{aa}	$\sigma_{a^2a^2}$	σ_{1a}	σ_{1a^2}	σ_{aa^2}	$\sigma_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$
Maximum Likelihood	2.643	2.328	0.102	0.775	0.429	−0.038	51.360
Composite τ	9.362	9.670	0.052	−4.019	−0.002	−0.327	5.164
S Rocke	9.467	3.373	0.222	2.170	1.062	−0.349	22.209
SMDM	5.745	0.092	0.115	0.727	0.813	0.103	25.385

Table 2: Autism data set. Estimated random term parameters by different methods.

consider a 2-way crossed classification with interaction linear mixed model

$$y_{fgh} = \boldsymbol{x}_{fgh}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + a_f + b_g + c_{fg} + e_{fgh}, \tag{23}$$

where $f = 1, \ldots, F$, $g = 1, \ldots, G$, and $h = 1, \ldots, H$. Here, we set $F = 2$, $G = 2$ and $H = 3$ which leads to $p = F \times G \times H = 12$. $\boldsymbol{x}_{fgh}$ is a $(k+1) \times 1$ vector where the last k components are from a standard multivariate normal and the first component is identically equal to 1, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = (0, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)^{\top}$ is $(k+1) \times 1$ vector of the fixed parameters with $k = 5$. a_f, b_g and c_{fg} are the random effect parameters which are normally distributed with variances σ_a^2, σ_b^2, and σ_c^2. Arranging the y_{fgh} in lexicon order (ordered by h within g within f) we obtain the vector $\boldsymbol{y}$ of dimension p and in the similar way the $p \times k$ matrix $\boldsymbol{x}$ obtained arranging $\boldsymbol{x}_{fgh}$. Similarly, we let $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_F)^{\top}$, $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_F)^{\top}$ and $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_{11}, \ldots, c_{FG})^{\top}$, that is, $\boldsymbol{a} \sim N_F(\boldsymbol{0}, \sigma_a^2 I_F)$ and similar for $\boldsymbol{b}$ and $\boldsymbol{c}$, while $\boldsymbol{e} = (e_{111}, \ldots, e_{FGH})^{\top} \sim N_p(\boldsymbol{0}, \sigma_e^2 I_p)$. Hence $\boldsymbol{y}$ is a p multivariate normal with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and variance matrix $\Sigma_0 = \eta_0(V_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{J} \gamma_j V_j)$, where $V_0 = I_p$, $V_1 = I_F \otimes J_G \otimes J_H$, $V_2 = J_F \otimes I_G \otimes J_H$, and $V_3 = J_F \otimes J_G \otimes I_H$; $\otimes$ is the Kronecker product and J is a matrix of ones with appropriate dimension. We took $\sigma_e^2 = \sigma_a^2 = \sigma_b^2 = 1$ and $\sigma_c^2 = 2$. Then $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0 = (\gamma_{10}, \gamma_{20}, \gamma_{30})^{\top} = (\sigma_a^2/\sigma_e^2, \sigma_b^2/\sigma_e^2, \sigma_c^2/\sigma_e^2)^{\top} = (1/4, 1/4, 1/2)^{\top}$ and $\eta_0 = \sigma_e^2 = 1/4$. We consider a sample of size $n = 100$ and four levels of contamination $\varepsilon = 0, 5, 10$ and 15%. In the CCM $n \times \varepsilon$ observations are contaminated by replacing all the elements of the vector $\boldsymbol{y}$ by observations from $\boldsymbol{y}_0 \sim N_p(\boldsymbol{x}_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\omega}_0, \Sigma)$ where the corresponding components of $\boldsymbol{x}$ are sampled from $\boldsymbol{x}_0 \sim N_{p\times k}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0, 0.005^2 \boldsymbol{I}_{p\times k})$ with all the components of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0$ equal to 1 in the case of low leverage outliers (lev1) or to 20 for large leverage outliers (lev20) and $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0$ is a p-vector of constants all equal to ω_0. In the ICM we replace $n \times p \times \varepsilon$ cells, randomly chosen in the $n \times p = 1200$ values of the dependent variable by $\boldsymbol{y}_0$ and the corresponding k vector of the explanatory

variables by $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ with values as in the previous case. In each cases we move ω_0 trying at attain the maximum MSE. For each combination of these factors we run the S-estimator as described in Victoria-Feser and Copt (2006) with ρ function with asymptotic rejection probability set to 0.01. We compute the composite τ-estimator with ρ_1 and ρ_2 in the family given by (14) with constant c equals to 1.64. For each case we run 500 Monte Carlo replications.

Let $(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x})$ be an observation independent of the sample $(\boldsymbol{y}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_1), \ldots, (\boldsymbol{y}_n, \boldsymbol{x}_n)$ used to compute $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{y}} = \boldsymbol{x}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ be the predicted value of $\boldsymbol{y}$ using $\boldsymbol{x}$. Then the square Mahalanobis distance between $\widehat{\boldsymbol{y}}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ using the matrix Σ_0 is

$$\begin{aligned} m(\widehat{\boldsymbol{y}}, \boldsymbol{y}, \Sigma_0) &= (\widehat{\boldsymbol{y}} - \boldsymbol{y})^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{y}} - \boldsymbol{y}) \\ &= (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^\top \boldsymbol{x}^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \boldsymbol{x} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \\ &+ (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{x}$ and has covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0$, putting $A = E(\boldsymbol{x}^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \boldsymbol{x})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[m(\widehat{\boldsymbol{y}}, \boldsymbol{y}, \Sigma_0)\right] &= E\left[(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^\top A (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\right] \\ &+ \operatorname{trace}(\Sigma_0^{-1} (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^\top) \\ &= E\left[(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^\top A (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\right] + p. \end{aligned}$$

Then, to evaluate an estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by its prediction performance we can use

$$E\left[m(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, A)\right] = E\left[(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^\top A (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\right]. \tag{24}$$

Let N be the number of replications in the simulation study, and let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j$, $1 \leq j \leq N$ be the value of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ at the j-th replication, then we can estimate $E\left[m(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, A)\right]$ by the Mean Square Mahalanobis distance

$$\text{MSMD} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} m(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, A).$$

It is easy to prove that as in this case $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a $p \times k$ matrix where the cells are independent $N(0, 1)$ random variables, then $A = \operatorname{trace}(\Sigma_0^{-1}) I_k$.

Given two covariance matrices Σ_1 and Σ_0, one way to measure how close are Σ_1 and Σ_0 is by the Kullback-Leibler divergence between two normal

Method	MSMD EFF.	MKLD EFF.
S	0.712	0.571
composite τ	0.806	0.739

Table 3: Relative efficiency of S- and composite τ- estimators

distributions with the same mean and covariance matrices equal to Σ_1 and Σ_0 given by

$$\text{KLD}(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_0) = \text{trace}\left(\Sigma_1 \Sigma^{-1}\right) - \log\left(\Sigma_1 \Sigma_0^{-1}\right) - p.$$

Since $(\eta_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$ determines $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma(\eta_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$, that is, the covariance matrix of $\boldsymbol{y}$ given $\boldsymbol{x}$, one way to measure the performance of an estimator $(\widehat{\eta}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})$ of $(\eta_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$ is by

$$E\left[\text{KLD}(\Sigma(\widehat{\eta}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0)\right].$$

Let $(\widehat{\eta}_j, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j), 1 \leq j \leq N$, be the value of $(\widehat{\eta}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})$ at the j-th replication, then we can estimate $E\left[\text{KLD}(\Sigma(\widehat{\eta}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0)\right]$ by the Mean Kullback-Leibler Divergence

$$\text{MKLD} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \text{KLD}(\Sigma(\widehat{\eta}_j, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0).$$

Table 3 reports the relative efficiency of the classic S- and composite τ-estimators with respect to the maximum likelihood in absence of contamination. The efficiency of estimators of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ will be measured for the MSMD ratio while the efficiency of an estimator of $(\eta_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$ by the MKLD ratio.

We report the results under 10% of both types outlier contamination: classical and independent. Figure 1 reports the behavior of the MSMD as a function of ω_0 while Figure 2 reports the behavior of MKLD. For easy of comparison, Table 4 reports the maximum values of MSMD and MKLD in the range of the Monte Carlo setting. Since similar behavior is observed for negative values of ω_0, these results are not reported.

Similar behavior was observed for the case 5% and 15% which are not reported here. The composite τ-estimator is very competitive with the classical S-estimator under the classical contamination model, in fact, in the low leverage case (lev1) the maximum values of MSMD and MKLD of the composite τ-estimator are only slightly larger than those of the S-estimator. Instead for the high leverage case (lev20) the values MSDM are of essentially



Figure 1: MSMD performance of the S- and composite τ-estimators of $\boldsymbol{\beta_0}$ under 10% of outlier contamination

the same for both estimators, while the maximum value of MKLD is smaller for the composite τ-estimator. In the independent contamination model the composite τ-estimator clearly outperforms the classical S-estimator. In fact, while the MSMD and MKLD of the composite τ-estimator are always bounded by a small value, the MSMD and MKLD of the classical S always show an unbounded behavior.



Figure 2: MKLD performance of the S- and composite τ-estimators of $(\eta_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma_0})$ under 10% of outlier contamination

		CCM		ICM	
	Method	lev1	lev20	lev1	lev20
MSDM	S	0.347	4.558	2406.850	116.080
	composite τ	0.791	4.325	3.170	4.292
MKLD	S	0.197	1.057	5819.794	85.281
	composite τ	0.435	0.744	2.086	1.204

Table 4: Maximum values of MSDM and MKLD in Figures 1 and 2 respectively for S- and composite τ-estimators

9 Conclusions

The independent contamination model presents new challenge problems for robust statistics. Robust estimators developed for the classical Tukey-Huber contamination model show non robust behavior under the ICM, in particular their breakdown point converges to zero as the dimension p increases. Furthermore, affine equivariance, a proven asset for achieving CCM robustness, becomes a hindrance under ICM because of outliers propagation. We introduce a new class of robust estimators namely composite S-estimators and composite τ-estimators which are based on M and τ-scales of the squared Mahalanobis distances of two dimensional subvectors of $\boldsymbol{y}$ using the same idea from the composite likelihood. We apply them in linear mixed models estimation. Our methods are equivariant for some selected transformations nevertheless provide fairly high resistance against both CCM and ICM outliers with breakdown point 0.5 and 0.25 respectively.

An `R` (R Core Team, 2014) package `robustvarComp` is available in the Comprehensive R Archive Network at
cran.r-project.org/web/packages/robustvarComp/index.html. The package implements composite S and τ-estimators and the classic S estimator for linear mixed models.

Acknowledgements

Victor Yohai research was partially supported by Grants PIP 112-200801-00216 and 112-201101-00339 from CONICET, PICT 2011-397 from ANPCYT and W276 from the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina.

A Estimating Equations and Algorithms

In this Appendix we provide the derivative of the loss function $T(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. For $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ a fixed point equation algorithm is also presented.

A.1 Derivation of the Estimating Equations for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$

Hereafter, we are going to derive the expression of $T_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \sum_{n,j,l} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \tau_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$. For this aim, let $\dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} = \Sigma_{jl}^{*-1/2} \boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl}$ and $\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl} = \Sigma_{jl}^{*-1/2} \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= \left(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^\top \Sigma_{jl}^{*-1} \left(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) \\ &= \left(\dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^\top \left(\dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The derivative of the squared Mahalanobis distances is

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= -2\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top} \left(\dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) \\ &= -2 \left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top} \dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) \\ &= -2 \left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl\top} \Sigma_{jl}^{*-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl\top} \Sigma_{jl}^{*-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $W_k(x) = \rho_k'(x)$ $(k = 1, 2)$ and

$$W_{k,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = W_k \left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \right)$$

be a weight function. We compute the derivative of $s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. We consider the equality

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho_1 \left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \right) = b$$

and we differentiate both sides

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \rho_1 \left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \right) = 0$$

which leads to the equation

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} W_1 \left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \right) \frac{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) - m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} = 0,$$

and replacing the terms by the previous calculation, leads to the following expression for $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= \frac{-2\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top} \dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl} \boldsymbol{\beta} \right)}{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \\ &= -2\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \dot{W}_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top} \dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl} \boldsymbol{\beta} \right),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\dot{W}_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \frac{W_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}.$$

We are going to derive $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \tau_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ to this aim we have

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \tau_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho_2 \left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \right) + s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \rho_2 \left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \right)$$

and since

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \rho_2 \left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \right) = \rho_2'(x)|_{x = m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) / s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \frac{\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}$$

by further letting

$$\begin{aligned}A_{k,jl} &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho_k \left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \right), \\ B_{k,jl} &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} W_k \left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \right) \frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})},\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\tau_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = &-\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{2,jl}\dot{W}_{1,i}^{jl}\left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\\ &-\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{2,i}^{jl}\left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\\ &+\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{2,i}^{jl}\left[\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\dot{W}_{1,k}^{jl}\left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_k^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_k^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_k^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_k^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right]\\ = &-\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left((A_{2,jl}-B_{2,jl})\dot{W}_{1,i}^{jl} + W_{2,i}^{jl}\right)\left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence differentiating (12) with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ leads to

$$T_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = -\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{p}\left((A_{2,jl}-B_{2,jl})\dot{W}_{1,i}^{jl} + W_{2,i}^{jl}\right)\left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) = \mathbf{0},$$

and finally, by letting $\tilde{W}_i^{jl} = (A_{2,jl}-B_{2,jl})\dot{W}_{1,i}^{jl} + W_{2,i}^{jl}$ a fixed point equation for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{p}\tilde{W}_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl}\right)\right]^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{p}\tilde{W}_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\left(\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{jl\top}\dot{\boldsymbol{y}}_i^{jl}\right). \tag{25}$$

A.2 Derivation of the Estimating Equations for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$

Let the residual $\boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl}$ be as follows

$$\boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl} = \boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}.$$

In order to obtain the estimating equations for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ we have to differentiate the function (12) with respect to $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. Let us write

$$m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl\top}{\Sigma_{jl}^{*}}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})\boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl},$$

and therefore

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl\top}\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}{\Sigma_{jl}^{*}}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})\boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl}.$$

Call σ_{jl} the (j,l) element of $\Sigma(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ and $v_{r,jl}$ the (j,l) element of V_r ($r = 1,\ldots,J$). We are going to assume without loss of generality that $\eta = 1$. We can write

$$\Sigma_{jl}^{*\,-1} = |\Sigma_{jl}|^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{ll} & -\sigma_{jl} \\ -\sigma_{jl} & \sigma_{jj} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{26}$$

Since $\sigma_{jl} = \delta_{jl} + \sum_{r=1}^{J} \gamma_r v_{r,jl}$ where $\delta_{jl} = 1$ if $j = l$ and 0 otherwise, and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_r}\sigma_{jl} = v_{r,jl}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_r}|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{jl}| &= (v_{r,ll}\sigma_{jj} + \sigma_{ll}v_{r,jj} - 2v_{r,jl}\sigma_{jl}) \\ &= 2c_{r,jl}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_{r,jl} = \frac{1}{2}v_{r,jj}\sigma_{ll} + \frac{1}{2}v_{r,ll}\sigma_{jj} - v_{r,jl}\sigma_{jl}.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial\sigma_{ll}/\partial\gamma_r & -\partial\sigma_{jl}/\partial\gamma_r \\ -\partial\sigma_{jl}/\partial\gamma_r & \partial\sigma_{jj}/\partial\gamma_r \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v_{r,ll} & -v_{r,jl} \\ -v_{r,jl} & v_{r,jj} \end{pmatrix} = |V_{r,jl}|V_{r,jl}^{-1}.$$

Then noting that $\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{ll} & -\sigma_{jl} \\ -\sigma_{jl} & \sigma_{jj} \end{pmatrix} = |\Sigma_{jl}|\ \Sigma_{jl}^{-1}$ differentiating (26) is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}\Sigma_{jl}^{*-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{ll} & -\sigma_{jl} \\ -\sigma_{jl} & \sigma_{jj} \end{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}|\Sigma_{jl}|^{-1/2} + |\Sigma_{jl}|^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \partial\sigma_{ll}/\partial\gamma_r & -\partial\sigma_{jl}/\partial\gamma_r \\ -\partial\sigma_{jl}/\partial\gamma_r & \partial\sigma_{jj}/\partial\gamma_r \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -|\Sigma_{jl}|^{-3/2} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{ll} & -\sigma_{jl} \\ -\sigma_{jl} & \sigma_{jj} \end{pmatrix} c_{r,jl} + |\Sigma_{jl}|^{-1/2}|V_{r,jl}|V_{r,jl}^{-1} \\ &= -|\Sigma_{jl}|^{-3/2}|\Sigma_{jl}|\Sigma_{jl}^{-1}c_{r,jl} + |\Sigma_{jl}|^{-1/2}|V_{r,jl}|V_{r,jl}^{-1} \\ &= |\Sigma_{jl}|^{-1/2}\left(+|V_{r,jl}|V_{r,jl}^{-1} - c_{r,jl}\Sigma_{jl}^{-1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = |\Sigma_{jl}|^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl\top}[|V_{r,jl}|V_{r,jl}^{-1} - c_{r,jl}\Sigma^{-1}]\boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl}.$$

We now compute the derivative of $s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ with respect to γ_r. We consider the equality

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\rho_1\left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\right) = b$$

and we differentiate both sides

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}\rho_1\left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\right)=0,\qquad 1\le r\le J,$$

which leads to the equation

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}W_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}-\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}W_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}^2(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})=0,$$

and replacing the terms by the previous calculation, leads to the following expression for $\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})&=\frac{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}W_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}W_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\\&=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\dot{W}_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\\&=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\dot{W}_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})|\Sigma_{jl}|^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl\top}\left(|V_{r,jl}|V_{r,jl}^{-1}-c_{r,jl}\Sigma_{jl}^{-1}\right)\boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl}.\end{aligned}$$

Going back to the derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}\tau_{jl}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}\tau_{jl}&=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\rho_2\left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\\&\quad+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}W_{2,i}\left(\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\right)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})-\frac{m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}s_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\right]\\&=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\left(A_{2,jl}-B_{2,jl}\right)\dot{W}_{1,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})+W_{2,i}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})\right]\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_r}m_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}).\end{aligned}$$

which leads to the estimating equation ($r=1,\ldots,J$)

$$T_{\gamma_r}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{p}\frac{\tilde{W}_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{|\Sigma_{jl}{}^{-1/2}(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma})|^{1/2}}\,\boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl\top}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\left(|V_{r,jl}|V_{r,jl}^{-1}-c_{r,jl}\Sigma_{jl}^{-1}(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma})\right)\boldsymbol{r}_i^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta})=0.\tag{27}$$

B Breakdown Point

To prove Theorems 1 and 2 that give lower bounds for the FSBDPCC and FSBDPIC of the composite τ-estimators respectively, we need the following Lemmas.

Lemma 1 *Consider a sample* $\boldsymbol{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{t}_n)$. *Let* $h = h(\boldsymbol{T})$ *and* $h^* = h^*(\boldsymbol{T})$ *be defined by (17) and (19) respectively. Define for all* (j, l)

$$\delta_{jl} = \inf_{\|\boldsymbol{b}\|=1, \boldsymbol{b}\in\mathbb{R}^k,\, 1\le i_1<\cdots<i_h<i_{h+1}\le n} \max\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_{i_1}^{jl}\boldsymbol{b}\|, \ldots, \|\boldsymbol{x}_{i_h}^{jl}\boldsymbol{b}\|, \|\boldsymbol{x}_{i_{h+1}}^{jl}\boldsymbol{b}\|\}$$

and

$$\delta_{jl}^* = \inf_{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|=1, \boldsymbol{u}\in\mathbb{R}^p, \boldsymbol{b}\in\mathbb{R}^k,\, 1\le i_1<\cdots<i_{h^*}<i_{h^*+1}\le n} \max\{\|\boldsymbol{u}^\top(\boldsymbol{y}_{i_1}^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_{i_1}^{jl}\boldsymbol{b})\|, \ldots, \|\boldsymbol{u}^\top(\boldsymbol{y}_{i_{h^*}}^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_{i_{h^*}}^{jl}\boldsymbol{b})\|, \|\boldsymbol{u}^\top(\boldsymbol{y}_{i_{h^*+1}}^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_{i_{h^*+1}}^{jl}\boldsymbol{b})\|\}. \tag{28}$$

Then, $\delta = \min_{jl}\delta_{jl} > 0$ *and* $\delta^* = \min_{jl}\delta_{jl}^* > 0$.

Proof. The proof follows from the definition of $h(\boldsymbol{T})$ and $h^*(\boldsymbol{T})$ in (17) and (19) respectively. ■

Lemma 2 *Consider the same assumptions as in Theorem (1), a sample* $\boldsymbol{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{t}_n)$ *and let* $m < \min((1-b)n - f(\boldsymbol{T}), bn)$. *Then, if* $\check{\boldsymbol{T}} \in \mathcal{T}_m^{(C)}$ *and* $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}})$ *is the* τ*-estimator of* $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ *for the sample* $\check{\boldsymbol{T}}$, *there exists* $K > 0$ *that for all couples* (j, l) $(1 \le j < l \le p)$, *the two eigenvalues of* $\Sigma_{jl}^*(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}))$, $\omega_{jl}^-(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}) \le \omega_{jl}^+(\check{\boldsymbol{T}})$ *are such that*

$$1 \le \frac{\omega_{jl}^+(\check{\boldsymbol{T}})}{\omega_{jl}^-(\check{\boldsymbol{T}})} \le K.$$

Proof. Suppose that lemma is not true for the couple (j, l). Then there exists a sequence $\{\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N\}_{1\le N<\infty}$ such that $\omega_{jl}^+(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)/\omega_{jl}^-(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N) \to \infty$. Since $|\Sigma_{jl}^*(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N))| = 1$ this is equivalent to $\omega_{jl}^-(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N) \to 0$. We are going to show that, for this sequence,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \tau_{jl}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)) = \infty. \tag{29}$$

Let U_N be an orthogonal matrix of eigenvectors of $\Sigma_{jl}^{*-1}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N))$ and Λ_N be the diagonal matrix with the corresponding eigenvalues, i.e., $\Lambda_N = \text{diag}(\lambda_{jlN}^+ = 1/\omega_{jlN}^-, \lambda_{jlN}^- = 1/\omega_{jlN}^+)$ and let

$$\boldsymbol{g}_{Ni} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{Ni1} \\ g_{Ni2} \end{pmatrix} = \left(U_N^\top \boldsymbol{y}_{Ni}^{jl} - U_N^\top \boldsymbol{x}_{Ni}^{jl} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N) \right),$$

then, calling $\boldsymbol{u}_{N1}$ the first column of U_N we get

$$\begin{aligned} m_{Ni}^{jl}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)) &= \left(\boldsymbol{y}_{Ni}^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_{Ni}^{jl} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N) \right)^\top U_N \Lambda_N U_N^\top \left(\boldsymbol{y}_{Ni}^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_{Ni}^{jl} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N) \right) \\ &= \left(U_N^\top \boldsymbol{y}_{Ni}^{jl} - U_N^\top \boldsymbol{x}_{Ni}^{jl} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N) \right)^\top \Lambda_N \left(U_N^\top \boldsymbol{y}_{Ni}^{jl} - U_N^\top \boldsymbol{x}_{Ni}^{jl} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N) \right) \\ &\geq \left(\boldsymbol{u}_{N1}^T \boldsymbol{y}_{Ni}^{jl} - \boldsymbol{u}_{N1}^T \boldsymbol{x}_{Ni}^{jlT} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N) \right)^2 \lambda_{jlN}^+ \\ &= g_{Ni1}^2 \lambda_{jlN}^+ \\ &= \frac{g_{Ni1}^2}{\omega_{jlN}^-}. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

By Lemma 1 there exists $\delta^* > 0$ such that for at least $n - f(\boldsymbol{T})$ observations from $\boldsymbol{T}$ we have

$$\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|=1, \boldsymbol{b}} \|\boldsymbol{u}^\top (\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl} \boldsymbol{b})\| > \delta^*$$

and we can find in any sample $\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N$ more than $[bn] + f(\boldsymbol{T})$ observations from the original sample and therefore $[bn] + 1$ indexes $i_1, \ldots, i_q, \ldots, i_{[bn]+1}$ such that

$$g_{Ni_q1}^2 \geq \delta^*, \ 1 \leq q \leq [bn] + 1.$$

Then according to equation (30) there are more than $[bn] + 1$ observations such that

$$m_{Ni_q}^{jl}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N), \hat{\gamma}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)) \to \infty.$$

Using Lemma A.3 of Garcia Ben, Martinez, and Yohai (2006) (see also Yohai and Zamar (1986)) this implies (29). On the other hand if we put $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_N = \boldsymbol{0}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_N = \boldsymbol{0}$ we will have, for all pair (j, l) more than $[bn] + 1$ observations such that the corresponding squared Mahalanobis distances are uniformly bounded on N and therefore by Lemma A.1 of Garcia Ben et al. (2006) (see also Yohai and Zamar (1986)) all the $\tau_{jl}(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{0})$ will be uniformly bounded and therefore $T(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{0})$ will be finite. This contradicts the definition of the composite τ-estimator for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. ■

Lemma 3 *Consider the same assumptions as in Theorem (1). Then for any* $m < \min((1-b)n - f(\boldsymbol{T}), bn)$ *we have* $B_m^{(C)}(\boldsymbol{T}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) < \infty$.

Proof. Assume that there exists a sequence $\{\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N\}_N$ with $\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N \in \mathcal{T}_m^{(\mathrm{C})}$ such that $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)\| \to \infty$ as $N \to \infty$. We can assume without loss of generality that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)/\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)\| \to \boldsymbol{c}_N$. Then, we will show that there exists a pair (j,l) such that $\tau_{jl}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)) \to \infty$ as $N \to \infty$. Let U_N be an orthogonal matrix of eigenvectors of $\Sigma_{jl}^{*-1}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N))$ and Λ_N be the diagonal matrix with the corresponding eigenvalues as in the proof of Lemma 2, hence

$$m_{Ni}^{jl}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)) = \boldsymbol{g}_{Ni}^{\top} \Lambda_N \boldsymbol{g}_{Ni}.$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{g}_{Ni} = \left(U_{Ni}^{\top} \boldsymbol{y}_{Ni}^{jl} - U_{Ni}^{\top} \boldsymbol{x}_{Ni}^{jl} \boldsymbol{c}_N \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)\| \right).$$

By Lemma 1 there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for at least $n - f(\boldsymbol{T})$ observations from $\boldsymbol{T}$ we have

$$\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{b}\|=1} \|(\boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl} \boldsymbol{b})\| > \delta \tag{31}$$

and we can find in any sample $\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N$ more than $[bn] + f(\boldsymbol{T})$ observations from the original sample. Therefore we can find $[bn]+1$ indexes $i_1, \ldots, i_q, \ldots, i_{[bn]}$ such that

$$\left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{Ni_q}^{jl} \frac{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)}{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)\|} \right\| \geq \delta, \ 1 \leq q \leq [bn]+1,$$

then,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} g_{Ni_qk} = \infty, \ 1 \leq q \leq [bn]+1, \ k = 1, 2.$$

According to the Lemma 2 the diagonal elements of the matrix Λ_N are greater than some positive constant K, this implies that for any vector $\boldsymbol{a}$

$$\boldsymbol{a}^{\top} \Lambda_N \boldsymbol{a} > K \|a\|^2, \tag{32}$$

which leads for $1 \leq q \leq [bn]+1$ to

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N\to\infty} m_{Ni_q}^{jl}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)) &= \lim_{N\to\infty} \boldsymbol{g}_{Ni_q}^{T} \Lambda_N \boldsymbol{g}_{Ni_q} \\ &\geq K \lim_{N\to\infty} \|\boldsymbol{g}_{Ni_q}\|^2 \\ &= \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have more than $[bn]+1$ elements $m^{jl}_{Ni_q}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N),\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N))$ going to infinity. Using Lemma A.3 of Garcia Ben et al. (2006) (see also Yohai and Zamar (1986)) this implies $\tau_{jl}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N),\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)) \to \infty$ as $N \to \infty$. Then $T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N),\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N))$ tends to infinity too. On the other hand if we put $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_N = \mathbf{0}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_N = \mathbf{0}$ we will have, for all pair (j,l) more than $[bn]$ observations such that the corresponding squared Mahalanobis distances are uniformly bounded on N and therefore by Lemma A.1 of Garcia Ben et al. (2006) (see also Yohai and Zamar (1986)) all the $\tau_{jl}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$ will be uniformly bounded and therefore $T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$ will be finite. This contradicts the definition of the composite τ-estimator for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. ■

Lemma 4 *Consider the same assumptions as in Theorem (1). Then, for any* $m < \min((1-b)n - f(\boldsymbol{T}), bn)$ *we have* $B_m^{-(C)}(\boldsymbol{T},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}) > 0$ *and* $B_m^{+(C)}(\boldsymbol{T},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}) < \infty$.

Proof. Recall that $\boldsymbol{v} = (\eta, \eta\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ and that $\Sigma(\eta,\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \eta\Sigma(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ and therefore from equation (10), η is the solution of

$$\frac{2}{p(p-1)n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{p}\rho_1\left(\frac{(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl}-\boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top\Sigma_{jl}(\eta,\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl}-\boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{s_0}\right) = b, \tag{33}$$

where $0 < s_0 < \infty$ is defined as follows

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\rho\left(\frac{v}{s_0}\right)\right) = b,\ v \sim \chi^2_2.$$

Assume that there exists a sequence $\{\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N\}_N$ with $\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N \in \mathcal{T}_m$, such that $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_n)\| \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. This implies that all the eigenvalues of the matrices $\Sigma_{jl}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_n))$ converge to zero. Then all the eigenvalues of the matrices $\Sigma_{jl}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_n))^{-1}$ converge to infinity. Let U_{Njl} and $\Lambda_{Njl} = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda^+_{Njl},\lambda^-_{Njl})$ be the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of these matrices and let

$$\boldsymbol{g}_{Ni} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{Ni1} \\ g_{Ni2} \end{pmatrix} = \left(U^\top_{Njl}\boldsymbol{y}^{jl}_{Ni} - U^\top_{Njl}\boldsymbol{x}^{jl}_{Ni}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)\right),$$

as in proof of Lemma 2. As shown in Lemma 1 there exists a $\delta^* > 0$ such that for at least $n - f(\boldsymbol{T})$ observations from $\boldsymbol{T}$ we have

$$\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|=1,\boldsymbol{b}} \|\boldsymbol{u}^\top(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\boldsymbol{b})\| > \delta^*,$$

and we can find in any sample $\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N$ more than $[bn]+f(\boldsymbol{T})$ observations from the original sample and therefore there are $[bn]+1$ indexes $i_1,\ldots,i_q,\ldots,i_{[bn]+1}$ such that

$$g^2_{Ni_q1} \geq \delta^*,\ 1 \leq q \leq [bn]+1.$$

Then, for $1 \leq q \leq [bn]+1$

$$\begin{aligned}(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl}_{i_q} - \boldsymbol{x}^{jl}_{i_q}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top \Sigma_{jl}(\eta,\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl}_{i_q} - \boldsymbol{x}^{jl}_{i_q}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) &= \boldsymbol{g}^\top_{Ni_q}\Lambda_{Njl}\boldsymbol{g}_{Ni_q} \\ &\geq g^2_{Ni_q1}\lambda^+_{Njl} \\ &\geq \delta^*\lambda^+_{Njl}\end{aligned}$$

and therefore we have

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl}_{i_q} - \boldsymbol{x}^{jl}_{i_q}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top \Sigma_{jl}(\eta,\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl}_{i_q} - \boldsymbol{x}^{jl}_{i_q}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \infty$$

for all pair (j,l) and $1 \leq q \leq [bn]+1$. Then, the fraction of squared Mahalanobis distances that goes to infinity in the left hand side of equation (10) is going to be larger than $[bn]$. Then, according to the Lemma A.3 of Garcia Ben et al. (2006) (see also Yohai and Zamar (1986)), this implies that the scale should go to infinity. This contradict the fact that according to (33) this scale is always s_0. Suppose that we assume that there exists a sequence $\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N$, $N \geq 1$ with $\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N \in \mathcal{T}_m$, such that $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\upsilon}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_n)\| \to \infty$ as $N \to \infty$. Then, we can similarly derive that the scale of the $\widehat{\eta}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N)^{-1}m^{jl}_{Ni}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N),\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\check{\boldsymbol{T}}_N))$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j,l \leq p$ tends to 0 and this contradicts again the fact that it is constantly equal to s_0. ■

Proof of Theorem 1. The proof of Theorem 1 follows immediately from Lemmas 2, 3 and 4. ■

Proof of Theorem 2. The proof of Theorem 2 follows immediately from Lemmas 2, 3 and 4 once we notice that the results of aforementioned Lemmas will continue to hold if the total number of contaminated rows (in one or both columns) for each pair (j,l) will be less than bn. To ensure this fact under the independent contamination model, it is sufficient to consider a contamination level not greater than $b/2$. ■

C Asymptotic properties

Hereafter we prove the Fisher Consistency of the estimating functional associated to the composite τ-estimator. Let $(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{x})$ with distribution F, then

given $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, the asymptotic M-scales $s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, F)$ are defined by

$$E\left(\rho_1\left(\frac{m(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}))}{s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, F)}\right)\right) = b,$$

and the asymptotic τ-scales $\tau^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, F)$ by

$$\tau^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, F) = s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, F) E\left(\rho_2\left(\frac{m(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}))}{s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, F)}\right)\right).$$

Finally, we define the asymptotic composite τ loss function as

$$T^a(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, F) = \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \sum_{l=j+1}^{p} \tau^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, F).$$

Then the estimating functional $(\boldsymbol{B}(F), \boldsymbol{G}(F))$ of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ associated to the composite τ-estimators is defined by

$$(\boldsymbol{B}(F), \boldsymbol{G}(F)) = \arg\min_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} T^a(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, F), \tag{34}$$

and the composite τ-estimator of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ can be defined by

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) = (\boldsymbol{B}(F_n), \boldsymbol{G}(F_n)), \tag{35}$$

where F_n is the empirical distribution of $(\boldsymbol{y}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_1), \ldots, (\boldsymbol{y}_n, \boldsymbol{x}_n)$.

Now we can state the theorem establishing the Fisher consistency of the estimating functional associated to the compose τ-estimators.

Theorem 5 *Let $(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x})$ have distribution F_0 and call H_0 the marginal distribution of $\boldsymbol{x}$. Assume (i) ρ_1 satisfies (A1-A5), (ii) ρ_2 satisfies A1-A6, (iii) under F_0 A7 and A8 holds and (iv) A9. Then, if $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \neq (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$*

$$T^a(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, F_0) > T^a(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0, F_0),$$

that is, $(\boldsymbol{B}(F_0), \boldsymbol{G}(F_0)) = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$.

The following lemmas are required to prove this Theorem.

Lemma 5 (Garcia Ben et al. (2006), A.10) *Suppose that ρ satisfies A1-A5 and $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a random vector of dimension h with density given by (21) with $\Sigma = \Sigma_0$ and f_0^* non increasing and with at least one point of decrease in the interval where ρ is strictly increasing. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a random vector independent of $\boldsymbol{u}$ and Σ a scatter matrix such that $|\Sigma| = |\Sigma_0|$. Then*

$$E\left(\rho\left((\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})^\top\Sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})\right)\right) \geq E\left(\rho\left(\boldsymbol{u}^\top\Sigma_0^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}\right)\right). \tag{36}$$

Moreover, if either (i) $P(\boldsymbol{v} \neq \boldsymbol{0}) > 0$ or (ii) $\Sigma \neq \Sigma_0$, then

$$E\left(\rho\left((\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})^\top\Sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})\right)\right) > E\left(\rho\left(\boldsymbol{u}^\top\Sigma_0^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}\right)\right). \tag{37}$$

Using the above result we can prove the following this Lemma.

Lemma 6 *Suppose that ρ satisfies A1-A5 and let $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ be as in Lemma 5 and let Σ be a $h \times h$ positive definite symmetric matrix. Put $\Sigma_0^* = \Sigma_0/|\Sigma_0|^{1/h}$ and $\Sigma^* = \Sigma/|\Sigma|^{1/h}$, then*

$$E\left(\rho\left((\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})^\top\Sigma^{*-1}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})\right)\right) \geq E\left(\rho\left(\boldsymbol{u}^\top\Sigma_0^{*-1}\boldsymbol{u}\right)\right). \tag{38}$$

Moreover, suppose that either (i) $P(\boldsymbol{v} \neq \boldsymbol{0}) > 0$ or (ii) $\Sigma \neq \alpha\Sigma_0$ for some $\alpha > 0$ then

$$E\left(\rho\left((\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})^\top\Sigma^{*-1}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})\right)\right) > E\left(\rho\left(\boldsymbol{u}^\top\Sigma_0^{*-1}\boldsymbol{u}\right)\right). \tag{39}$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\rho}(u) = \rho(u|\Sigma_0|^{1/h})$. Clearly $\tilde{\rho}$ satisfies A1-A5 too. Put $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma|\Sigma|^{-1/h}|\Sigma_0|^{1/h}$ and note that Σ_1 is different from Σ_0 but with the same determinant. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} E\left(\rho\left(\boldsymbol{u}^\top\Sigma_0^{*-1}\boldsymbol{u}\right)\right) &= E\left(\rho\left(\boldsymbol{u}^\top\Sigma_0^{-1}|\Sigma_0|^{1/h}\boldsymbol{u}\right)\right) \\ &= E\left(\tilde{\rho}\left(\boldsymbol{u}^\top\Sigma_0^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E\left(\rho\left((\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})^\top\Sigma^{*-1}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})\right)\right) = E\left(\tilde{\rho}\left((\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})^\top\Sigma_1^{-1}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})\right)\right).$$

Then Lemma 6 follows from Lemma 5 ■

Lemma 7 *Assume that (i) ρ_1 satisfies A1-A5, (ii) ρ_2 satisfies A1, A6 (iii) A7 holds with $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0$. Then, $s_{jl}^a(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \geq s_{jl}^a(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$ and $\tau_{jl}^a(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \geq \tau_{jl}^a(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$ for all couples (j,l) Moreover, if for the pairs (j,l) either*

$$P(\boldsymbol{x}^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{x}^{jl}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \neq \boldsymbol{0}) > 0 \quad or \quad \Sigma_{jl}(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \neq \alpha\Sigma_{jl}(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0) \tag{40}$$

for all $\alpha > 0$, then $s_{jl}^a(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) > s_{jl}^a(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$ and $\tau_{jl}^a(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) > \tau_{jl}^a(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$.

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{q} = \boldsymbol{x}(\boldsymbol{\beta}-\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$, then $\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{q}$, where $\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Observe that $\boldsymbol{q}$ depends only on $\boldsymbol{x}$ and hence it is independent of $\boldsymbol{u}$. Moreover $\boldsymbol{u}^{jl}$ has an elliptical distribution with density of the form

$$\frac{g(\boldsymbol{u}^{jl\top}\Sigma_{jl}(\eta_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}^{jl})}{|\Sigma_{jl}(\eta_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)|^{1/2}},$$

where g is non increasing and strictly increasing in a neighborhood of 0. Them, by Lemma 6 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left(\rho_1\left(\frac{m(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl},\boldsymbol{\mu}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}),\Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}))}{s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)}\right)\right) = \\
&= E\left(\rho_1\left(\frac{\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0-\boldsymbol{\beta})+\boldsymbol{u}^{jl}\right)^\top\Sigma^{*-1}_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0-\boldsymbol{\beta})+\boldsymbol{u}^{jl}\right)}{s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)}\right)\right) \\
&= E\left(\rho_1\left(\frac{\left(\boldsymbol{u}^{jl}-\boldsymbol{q}^{jl}\right)^\top\Sigma^{*-1}_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})\left(\boldsymbol{u}^{jl}-\boldsymbol{q}^{jl}\right)}{s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)}\right)\right) \\
&\geq E\left(\rho_1\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{u}^{jl\top}\Sigma^{*-1}_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)\boldsymbol{u}^{jl}}{s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)}\right)\right) \qquad (41)\\
&= E\left(\rho_1\left(\frac{m(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl},\boldsymbol{\mu}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0),\Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0))}{s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)}\right)\right) = b,
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore $s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\gamma) \geq s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma_0})$. Under at least one of the two assumptions in (40), by Lemma 6 the inequality in (41) becomes a strict inequality and hence $s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) > s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$.

Lemma A.8 in Garcia Ben et al. (2006) proves that the function $\tau(s) = s\ E(\rho_2(v/s))$ is a non-decreasing function of s for any non negative value v under A1-A6. Using this result and since $s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) > s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau^2_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})E\left(\rho_2\left(\frac{m(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl},\boldsymbol{\mu}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}),\Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}))}{s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\right)\right) \\
&\geq s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)E\left(\rho_2\left(\frac{m(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl},\boldsymbol{\mu}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}),\Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}))}{s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)}\right)\right) \\
&\geq s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)E\left(\rho_2\left(\frac{m(\boldsymbol{y}^{jl},\boldsymbol{\mu}^{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0),\Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0))}{s^a_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)}\right)\right) = \tau^2_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0).
\end{aligned}$$

When one of the two assumptions in (40) hold, the last inequality is strict proving that $\tau^2_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\gamma}) > \tau^2_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$. ■

Proof of Theorem 5.

Consider first the case of $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \neq \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0$. According to the Lemma 7 it is enough to show that $\Sigma(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \neq \Sigma(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$ implies that there exists at least one pair (j,l) such that $\Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \neq \Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$. We prove it by contradiction. Let us assume that $\Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \Sigma^*_{jl}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq l \leq p$ this implies that for all (j,l) there exists α_{jl} such that $\Sigma_{jl}(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \alpha_{jl}\Sigma_{jl}(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$. However $\alpha_{jl} = \alpha_{j'l}$ since the corresponding matrices have one common element and similarly we can prove that $\alpha_{jl} = \alpha_{jl'}$. Then all α_{jl} are equals to a same value α. Then $\Sigma(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \alpha\Sigma(1,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$ contradicting A9. Consider now the case $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \boldsymbol{\beta}-\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \neq \mathbf{0}$. It will be enough, according to Lemma 7, that there exists a pair (j,l) such that $P(\boldsymbol{x}^{jl}\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq \mathbf{0}) > 0$. For this to be true it is enough to show that there exists a j such that $P(\boldsymbol{x}^j\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq 0) > 0$ where $\boldsymbol{x}^j$ stands for the j row of the $p \times k$ matrix $\boldsymbol{x}$. Let us assume that $P(\boldsymbol{x}^j\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq 0) = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p$. Since $\{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq \mathbf{0}\} = \cup_{j=1}^p \{\boldsymbol{x}^j\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq 0\}$ then

$$0 \leq P(\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq \mathbf{0}) = P\left(\cup_{j=1}^p \{\boldsymbol{x}^j\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq 0\}\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^p P(\boldsymbol{x}^j\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq 0) = 0.$$

And this contradict the assumption A8. ■

Heuristic proof of Theorem 3. It can be proved that the functional $(\boldsymbol{B}(F), \boldsymbol{G}(F))$ defined in (34) is continuous at F_0 with the topology associated to the convergence in distribution. Let F_n be the empirical distribution of $(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then $F_n \xrightarrow{d} F_0$ a.s. (where $\xrightarrow{d}$ denotes weak convergence). Then $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) = (\boldsymbol{B}(F_n), \boldsymbol{G}(F_n)) \xrightarrow{d} (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0)$.

Note that

$$(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top \Sigma_{jl}(1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$$

has approximately the distribution of ηv, where v has chi square distribution with two degree of freedom. Therefore by (7) given any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\frac{2}{p(p-1)n}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^p \rho\left(\frac{(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top \Sigma_{jl}(1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\eta_0 + \varepsilon}\right) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} E\left(\rho\left(\frac{\eta_0 v}{\eta_0 + \varepsilon}\right)\right) < b. \quad (42)$$

Similarly

$$\frac{2}{p(p-1)n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{p}\rho\left(\frac{(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl}-\boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top\Sigma_{jl}(1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y}_i^{jl}-\boldsymbol{x}_i^{jl}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\eta_0-\varepsilon}\right)\overset{\text{a.s.}}{\to}E\left(\rho\left(\frac{\eta_0 v}{\eta_0-\varepsilon}\right)\right)$$
$$> b. \quad (43)$$

Therefore by (10) with probability one there exist n_0 such that for $n \geq n_0, \eta_0 - \varepsilon < \widehat{\eta} < \eta_0 + \varepsilon$. This implies that $\widehat{\eta} \to \eta_0$ a.s.. ■

References

Agostinelli, C., Leung, A., Yohai, V.J., and Zamar, R.H. (2014). Robust estimation of multivariate location and scatter in the presence of cellwise and casewise contamination. submitted, `arXiv:0707.3168`.

Alqallaf, F., Van Aelst, S., Zamar, R., and Yohai, V.J. (2009). Propagation of outliers in multivariate data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(1):311–331.

Anderson, D.K., Oti, R.S., Lord, C., and Welch, K. (2009). Patterns of growth in adaptive social abilities among children with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 37:1019–1034.

Chervoneva, I. and Vishnyakov, M. (2011). Constrained s-estimators for linear mixed effects models with covariance components. *Statistics in Medicine*, 30(14):1735–1750.

Copt, S. and Heritier, S. (2006). MM-estimation and inference in mixed linear models. Technical Report 2006.01, Faculté des Sciences Économiques et Sociales, Université de Genève.

Davies, P.L. (1987). Asymptotic behaviour of S-Estimates of multivariate location parameters and dispersion matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 15 (3):1269–1292.

Donoho, D.L. (1982). Breakdown properties of multivariate location estimators. *Qualifying paper, Harvard University, Boston.*

Donoho, D.L. and Huber, P.J. (1983). The notion of breakdown point. A Festschrift for Erich L. Lehmann.

Garcia Ben, M., Martinez, E., and Yohai, V.J. (2006). Robust estimation for the multivariate linear model based on a τ-scale. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 97:1600–1622.

Gill, P.S. (2000). A robust mixed linear model analysis for longitudinal data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 19:975–987.

Heritier, S., Cantoni, E., Copt, S., and Victoria-Feser, M.P. (2009). *Robust methods in Biostatistics*. John Wiley & Sons.

Jacqmin-Gadda, H., Sibillot, S., Proust, C., Molina, J., and Thiébaut, R. (2007). Robustness of the linear mixed model to misspecified error distribution. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51:5142–5154.

Jiang, J. and Zhang, W. (2001). Robust estimation in generalised linear mixed models. *Biometrika*, 88(3):753–765.

Koller, M. (2013a). *Robust Estimation of Linear Mixed Models*. PhD thesis, ETH Zürich.

Koller, M. (2013b). robustlmm: Robust linear mixed effects models. URL `cran.r-project.org/web/packages/robustlmm/index.html`.

Lachosa, V.H., Deyb, D.K., and Canchoc, V.G. (2009). Robust linear mixed models with skew-normal independent distributions from a bayesian perspective. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 139:4098–4110.

Lindsay, B.G. (1988). Composite likelihood methods. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 80(1):221–39. URL `www.stat.psu.edu/~bgl/center/tr/PUB88a.pdf`.

Maronna, R.A., Martin, R.D., and Yohai, V.J. (2006). *Robust Statistics. Theorey and Methods*. Wiley.

Muler, N. and Yohai, V.J. (2002). Robust estimators for ARCH processes. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 23:341–375.

R Core Team (2014). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL `http://www.R-project.org/`.

Rousseeuw, P. (1985). Multivariate estimation with high breakdown point. In Grossmann, W., Pflug, G., Vincze, I., and Wertz, W., editors, *Mathematical Statistics and Applications*, pages 283–297. Reidel Publishing Company (co-published with Akadémiai e Kiadó, Budapest).

Searle, S.R., Casella, G., and Mcculloch, C.E. (1992). *Variance Components*. John Wiley and Sons.

Sinha, S.K. (2004). Robust analysis of generalized linear mixed models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99(466):451–460.

Stahel, W.A. (1981). *Robuste Schätzungen: infinitesimale Optimalität und Schätzungen von Kovarianzmatrizen*. PhD thesis, ETH Zürich.

Victoria-Feser, M.P. and Copt, S. (2006). High breakdown inference in the mixed linear model. *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 101:292–300.

West, B.T., Welch, K.B., and Galecki, A.T. (2007). *Linear Mixed Models: A Practical Guide Using Statistical Software*. Chapman & Hall/CRC.

Yohai, V.J. and Zamar, R.H. (1986). High breakdown point estimates of regression by means of the minimization of an efficient scale. Technical Report No. 84, Department of Statistics, University of Washington.

Yohai, V.J. and Zamar, R.H. (1988). High breakdown-point estimates of regression by means of the minimization of an efficient scale. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83:460–413.

Yohai, V.J. and Zamar, R.H. (1997). Optimal locally robust m-estimates of regression. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Infererence*, 64:309–323.